

REMARKS:

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 10, 20, and 21 (each of the independent claims) are amended to clarify recitation of the invention. Dependent claims 3 and 12, along with each of the independent claims, are amended to change “intended” to the more structural term “configured.” Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance in view of such amendments and the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-9 and 20 (of which claims 1 and 20 are independent) are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Horvath, U.S. 3,643,968. Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection.

The independent claims are amended to specify that the recesses are delimited by the side surface of the sealing strip and inner sides of the protrusions that face the side surface of the sealing strip. Horvath does not show that. In Horvath, the holes 35 (what the Examiner is interpreting as the recesses) are formed in the protrusions, away from the body of the gasket, such that they are delimited entirely by the protrusions themselves. Therefore, Horvath does not anticipate any of the subject claims, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-10, and 13-21 (of which claims 1, 10, 20, and 21 are independent) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Hammi, U.S. 6,761,360. Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection.

As noted, the independent claims are amended to specify that the recesses are enclosed and are delimited by the side surface of the sealing strip and inner sides of the protrusions that face the side surface of the sealing strip. Hammi does not show that. In Hammi, the space 40'', which is what the Examiner construes as the claim-recited recesses, is formed between the two bulbous circumferential beads formed by ridges 46A''/48A'' and 46B''/48B'', which is what the Examiner construes as the claim-recited protrusions. Therefore, Hammi does not anticipate any of the subject claims, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4-9, 10, 13-19, and 20 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Sumitomo, JP 9112699. Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection.

As noted, the independent claims are amended to specify that the recesses are enclosed and are delimited by the side surface of the sealing strip and inner sides of the protrusions that face the side surface of the sealing strip. Sumitomo does not show that. In Sumitomo, the slots on either side of the T-shaped protrusions, which are what the Examiner construes as the claim-recited recesses, are open-ended, i.e., not enclosed. Therefore, Sumitomo does not anticipate any of the subject claims, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Alternatively, claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Sumitomo in view of Nathan, U.S. 2,615,741. Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection.

As noted, the independent claims are amended to specify that the recesses are enclosed and are delimited by the side surface of the sealing strip and inner sides of the protrusions that face the side surface of the sealing strip. Sumitomo does not show that as explained above, and Nathan does not rectify that deficiency. Therefore, the combination of Sumitomo and Nathan does not yield any of the subject claims, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance, and timely Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

The undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application.

The undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 14-1437, referencing Attorney Docket No.: 6730.054.PCUS00.

In order to facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, the Examiner may directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion.

Novak, Druce & Quigg, LLP
1000 Louisiana, Suite 5300
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 571-3400
(713) 456-2836 (fax)
tracy.druce@novakdruce.com

Respectfully submitted,

/Tracy W. Druce/

Tracy W. Druce, Esq.
Reg. No. 35,493